The Acquittal of the Trustworthy

براءة الأمناء

From the Lies Concocted Against them by the Disgraceful & Deceptive Ignoramuses

Shaykh Rabee' ibn Haadee ibn 'Umayr al-Madkhalee

(May Allaah preserve him)

In the Name of Allaah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful…

All praise is due to Allaah. May He raise the rank of the Messenger and grant him peace, as well as his family, companions, and all those who follow his guidance.

To proceed:

I came across a post written by Faalih al-Harbee that was published on the "Atharee" Web site, posted by someone named "Sulaymaan al-Harbee". It is part of an article called "Tanbeeh al-Alib-baa'", based on lies, deception, and a concoction of false accusations. However, this is not out of the ordinary for Faalih, since something taken from its very source material is not shocking at all. A cup can only pour out what it holds in it.

Having said this, the Science of Disparagement and Endorsement (*al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*) has conditions:

1 – Knowledge, especially about the reasons for the disparagement or endorsement;

2 – From them: *Taqwaa* of Allaah, and being mindful of Him.

These two conditions are not fulfilled by Faalih and his group.

Being cautious and having *taqwaa* find no home in his dealings with the Salafees, especially as he speaks ill of their scholars, those whose uprightness and trustworthiness are well known to everyone, and praise of them is widespread amongst the people, the likes of: Shaykh Naasir ad-Deen al-Albaanee, Shaykh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen, Shaykh Ahmad ibn Yahyaa an-Najmee, Shaykh Zayd ibn Muhammad Haadee al-Madkhalee, Rabee' ibn Haadee, Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree, and Shaykh Saalih as-Suhaymee.

One member of his clique, namely Faarooq al-Ghaythee, has even gone so far as to speak ill of the *muftee* of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh 'Abdul-'Azeez Aalush-Shaykh, Shaykh Saalih al-Luhaydaan, and Shaykh Saalih ibn Fawzaan al-Fawzaan, as a result of following Faalih's *manhaj*.

Such people are the eminent heads of *Ahlus-Sunnah*. Whoever speaks ill of them falls down upon his own face, and his innovation and animosity towards the Sunnah and its people becomes clear. Especially when it comes to the likes of Faalih al-Harbee and his anonymous sect that has become known for following desires, lying, and ignorance.

Their disparagement of others is not acceptable, not even when they speak about the common-folk. Nor is their testimony acceptable in the least significant of affairs. So how could their disparagement of the eminent heads of *Ahlus-Sunnah* be accepted?!!

This little group of Haddaadees has gone overboard in their slander, disparagement, lies, and wicked behavior towards the eminent heads of *Ahlus-Sunnah*.

At the very head of those who speak ill (of *Ahlus-Sunnah*) is Mahmood al-Haddaad, 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel, and Faalih al-Harbee. The latter (Faalih) has actually become the worst and most evil of them all!

The lies and wickedness of the first two (al-Haddaad and Baashmeel) have been made clear to *Ahlus-Sunnah* in my clarifications based on clear evidences in the two books: "Mujaazafaat al-Haddaad" and "Izhaaq Abaateel 'Abdil-Lateef Baashmeel".

The lies and wickedness of Faalih have also been exposed by some Salafee authors, based on clear proofs as well.

And so today we are with Faalih, the pioneering leader of calamities, commotion, and lies, to examine this article of his, which will be the topic of debate.

[The First Point of Contention]

[1]: Faalih says (p.44):

> It has been established by conclusive proof that al-Madkhalee is like "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" in truncating (misquoting) people's words and in other things that I have made clear, and he also makes claims about the scholars similar to the claims of "an-Naasih as-Saadiq". He then attributes to them his invented distortions and the lies he has concocted against them. This is exactly what al-Madkhalee has done in his refutation of Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee entitled: "I'aanatu Abil-Hasan 'alar-Rujoo' billatee hiya Ahsan" (p.15 of *Majaalis al-Hudaa*'s printing, Algeria). In it, he quotes the following from Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, as found in "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah min Fataawaa Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah" of al-Ba'lee: **"And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers or those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins."**
>
> And this is how he quoted it, bolded and underlined, without separating it (with a comma or a period). He has made it one phrase, placing a period at the end, which denotes that the words were all together in that fashion all the way up to the period.
>
> And he has built upon this, through lying and conspiracy, that Shaykh al-Islaam prohibited the people from invoking mercy upon anyone who died upon disobedience, saying: **"So here is Ibn Taymiyyah**

> **prohibiting the invoking of mercy upon those who die openly disobedient. Thus, whoever dies openly disobedient while also calling to innovation is even more deserving of having this ruling applied to him."**
>
> It should be noted that Ibn Taymiyyah elaborated on the issue of praying over disobedient people, and he did not elaborate on the issue of invoking mercy on those who die openly disobedient.

Commentary:

Firstly, what tremendous affairs are found in these words that are established by decisive evidence against Rabee' al-Madkhalee?

1. Truncating quotes and other things: So he is **like "an-Naasih as-Saadiq"** in this regard, and in other affairs that (Shaykh!) Faalih has clarified.

2. Then he says that Rabee' makes claims about the scholars similar to the way that "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" makes them, and that he attributes to them his invented distortions and the lies he has concocted against them.

3. Then he emphasizes these affairs that have been established against Rabee' al-Madkhalee by way of decisive proof, by saying, "This is exactly what al-Madkhalee has done in his refutation of Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee entitled: "I'aanatu Abil-Hasan 'alar-Rujoo' billatee hiya Ahsan" (p.15 of *Majaalis al-Hudaa*'s printing, Algeria)." So then Rabee' al-Madkhalee, as far as he is concerned, is actually worse than "an-Naasih as-Saadiq", since he has a record of betrayal, misquoting, and making false, deceitful claims against the scholars, and then attributing these distortions and lies to them!

What is new about this article is that Faalih now makes a distinction between Rabee' al-Madkhalee and "an-Naasih as-Saadiq", after he and his sect used to explicitly claim that "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" is actually Rabee'. So now Rabee' has turned out to be other than "an-Naasih as-Saadiq", however he still has a bad record, and he is even worse than "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" as far as he is concerned!!

4. Now we are with Faalih, the trustworthy one of honor! Let us name him: "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" (the honest advisor), so Rabee's betrayal can be established for us by way of decisive evidence, along with his distortions, misquotes, and lies!! He says (and how well he has spoken!): "In it, he quotes the following from Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, as found in "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah min Fataawaa Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah" of al-Ba'lee: "And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers or those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins."

Faalih, the honest, honorable advisor (!), through his genius and intelligence (!), has clarified what Rabee' al-Madkhalee has fallen into of betrayal, plotting, and deception

(!), only after he himself has fallen into deception by taking this quote out of its context without quoting what is before it, saying (and how well he has spoken!):

> And this is how he quoted it, bolded and underlined, without separating it (with a comma or a period). He has made it one phrase, placing a period at the end, which denotes that the words were all together in that fashion all the way up to the period.
>
> And he has built upon this, through lying and conspiracy, that Shaykh al-Islaam prohibited the people from invoking mercy on anyone who died upon disobedience, saying: "So here is Ibn Taymiyyah prohibiting the invoking of mercy upon those who die openly disobedient. Thus, whoever dies openly disobedient while also calling to innovation is even more deserving of having this applied to him."
>
> It should be noted that Ibn Taymiyyah elaborated on the issue of praying over disobedient people, and he did not elaborate on the issue of invoking mercy on those who die openly disobedient.

So here are a number of (decisive!) proofs showing Rabee' al-Madkhalee's treachery, lies, and misquoting of the words of Shaykh al-Islaam, and his attributing these distortions and lies of his to Shaykh al-Islaam!!

Is it possible for us to challenge this genius of an *imaam* (!!) and these decisive proofs and genius findings of his?!

Every racehorse trips once or twice!! He views that these affairs of misquoting and distortion, etc. are established by way of decisive proofs!! However, I oppose him in this claim. I believe that what is established by way of evidence is that he, with all his genius (!), is the one who has acted treacherously, misquoted, and erred wildly in his claim and the resulting judgement. My evidences are as follows:

1. I had conveyed all five paragraphs of the words of Shaykh al-Islaam with every bit of integrity and precision, paragraph by paragraph, word by word, and letter by letter, in the very order that I found them. And I did not change anything at the beginning or the end of the words. Dear brother and reader, here are the five paragraphs from the words of Shaykh al-Islaam, just as they are found on page 131, the very page I used as my reference, from *Daar al-'Aasimah*'s printing, with commentary by al-'Allaamah Ibn 'Uthaymeen, may Allaah have mercy on him:

> **It is befitting that the people of knowledge and *Deen* do not pray over those who die and did not used to pay *zakaah* or pray except in Ramadhaan, as a penalty and a punishment for their kind of people. This is understood from when the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did not pray over the man who killed himself, the man who stole from the war booty before its distribution, or the man who had debts and had not paid them off. However, some people must pray over them.**

> **Furthermore, whoever knows of a hypocrite is not to pray over him, while others who do not know that he is a hypocrite will pray over him.**
>
> **And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers or those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins.**
>
> **And it is good for people to refrain from praying over any one of these types to set an example for those who are like them and behave like them. It is also fine for someone to pray over one of them, hoping that Allaah will have mercy on him, so long as there is no clear overall benefit in refraining from the prayer. Moreover, refraining from praying over him openly, while privately supplicating for him, combines both advantages, and, thus, is more appropriate then doing only one or the other.**
>
> **And the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam)* did not wash the body of the martyr, nor did he pray over him. This shows that the prayer is not obligatory in the first place. And the recommended nature of not doing something does not prove that it is prohibited.**

So in what religion and in what language would I be considered a lying betrayer and everything else this man has said about me because of what I have done here?!

2. I have a right to say that he is the one who has slandered and lied on me, and that he is the one who deceived and misquoted by taking this one paragraph alone away from the others in order to hide the reality of the affair, making the people think that I did not quote except this one paragraph from Shaykh al-Islaam! Then, he increases in his camouflaging and misleading statements by not mentioning the page number that I quoted from and cited, p.131 of the book "Ikhtiyaaraat Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah" (may Allaah have mercy on him), the *Daar al-'Aasimah* printing that has the commentary and corrections of al-'Allaamah Ibn 'Uthaymeen (may Allaah have mercy on him).

3. He fell into another act of treachery and yet another huge plot when he deleted my statement:

> There are scholars who hold the position of not praying over the people of innovations. At the very head of them is the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*), when he said, ((**The Qadariyyah are the Magians of this Ummah, disbelievers in the pre-destined events that Allaah has decreed. If they become ill, do not visit them. If they die, then do not attend (their funerals).**)) It was collected by Ahmad (2/125, 5/407), Ibn Maajah (1/35, #92), Ibn Abee 'Aasim in *As-Sunnah* (p.144), and al-Aajurree in *Ash-Sharee'ah* (190-191). In his commentary of Ibn Maajah, As-Sindee quotes Ibn

> Hajr as having declared the *hadeeth* to be *saheeh*. Al-Albaanee also called it *hasan*[1] in *Thilaal al-Jannah* (p.144) and in *Saheeh Ibn Maajah* (1/22, #75). Refer to: "Mawqif Ahlis-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah min Ahlil-Ahwaa' wal-Bida'" (1/412).
>
> From them (the scholars who held the position of not praying over the people of innovations) are Ibn 'Abbaas, Ibn 'Umar, Mujaahid, Maalik, al-Layth, and Aboo Thawr. Regarding the Qadariyyah, they said, "Do not visit their sick, and do not pray over their dead." Aboo Thawr said, "We do not pray behind them." Refer to: "Mawqif Ahlis-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah min Ahlil-Ahwaa' wal-Bida'" (1/413), where the author has mentioned the sources for all these statements.
>
> About the Jahmiyyah, Bishr ibn al-Haarith said, "Do not sit with them and do not speak to them. If they become ill, do not visit them. If they die, do not attend (their funerals)." This is found in *As-Sunnah* of 'Abdullaah ibn Ahmad (1/126). And Muhammad ibn Yahyaa al-'Adanee said, "Whoever says that the Qur'aan is created is a disbeliever who is not to be followed in prayer… and their funerals are not to be attended, nor are their sick to be visited." (al-Laalakaa'ee, 2/325)

He deleted all of these words, betraying and scheming, since they would destroy his rumors and those of his ally in the war against *Ahlus-Sunnah*, Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee. They both claim that *Ahlus-Sunnah* have reached scholarly consensus over the permissibility, or legislated nature, of praying over the people of innovation. The words that he left out contain a nullification of this claim.

Furthermore, my position that I held before is the same as my current position, which is in accordance with the majority of *Ahlus-Sunnah* who say: It is permissible to pray over the innovators of the people of the *qiblah* (Muslims) and their disobedient ones, so long as they were within the fold of Islaam.

[The Second Point of Contention]

[2]: Faalih says:

> And he has built upon this, through lying and fabrication, that Shaykh al-Islaam prohibited the people from invoking mercy on anyone who died upon disobedience, saying: **"So here is Ibn Taymiyyah prohibiting the invoking of mercy upon those who die openly disobedient. Thus, whoever dies openly disobedient while also**

[1] The majority of the scholars did not use this *hadeeth*, most likely avoiding it because they did not view it as being authentic. Or perhaps some considered it authentic but seemingly contradictory to other evidences which are more authentic or more correct according to them, and thus they give those evidences priority over it.

calling to innovation is even more deserving of having this applied to him."

Commentary:

1. His slandering of me, that I have lied and conspired, based on what I understood from Ibn Taymiyyah's explicit words, is indeed a proof of the ignorance of this man, his uncivilized behavior, and his distance from knowledge and its people. I have not made Shaykh al-Islaam's words carry improbable meanings. On the contrary, his words are clear regarding what I have understood from them. Even if I had been mistaken in my understanding of the meaning of these words of Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, and then someone from the people of knowledge, intellect, and integrity came across that and opposed me in my understanding, they would not view it permissible in any way whatsoever to rule on me that I have lied upon Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, ascribing me with lying and fabrication. For it may be that a scholar errs in his understanding of Allaah's Speech, the speech of His Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*), or the words of the scholars. In such a case, his understanding could not be described with other than just being a mistake, while they would hold that he receives one full reward, due to his effort to reach the truth; and if he attained it then he would receive two rewards.

Even some of the Companions and the *imaams* erred in their understandings of the Speech of Allaah and that of His Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*). No Muslim of intellect would ever consider describing them as having lied and conspired. So how much more so for the one who was not mistaken in the first place?!

2. Al-Ba'lee (may Allaah have mercy on him) and others who have authored works about the *fiqh* positions of Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah are only quoting him in issues that are differed over, not issues that are agreed upon.

This issue specifically is one that is differed over. I have presented to you some quotes about that differing, quotes that Faalih has run from and tried to cover up.

Furthermore, what would prevent Shaykh al-Islaam, religiously or intellectually, from taking a position that others before him held, as I have mentioned? Those whose position is to refrain from praying over the innovators, the Qadariyyah and Jahmiyyah, and not to invoke mercy upon them? So then what prevents Shaykh al-Islaam, religiously or intellectually, from holding the position that one does not pray over nor invoke mercy (which is a part of the prayer) upon those who die openly disobedient?

And if another position is found attributed to him, this would mean that he changed his position based on another *ijtihaad*, as is the case with the scholars. This will be explained in detail shortly.

So Shaykh al-Islaam's case is just like the case of the scholars from amongst the Companions (may Allaah be pleased with them) and other than them, who held one

position in a certain issue and then changed their position at another point in time or with another *fatwaa*.

He is rewarded in both cases. He receives two rewards when he reaches the truth and one reward when he errs, and Allaah excuses him for his mistakes, as is found in the *hadeeth* of 'Amr ibn al-'Aas, who heard the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) say, ((**When a judge makes an *ijtihaad* in a judgment and he is correct, then he gets two rewards. When he makes an *ijtihaad* in a judgment and he is mistaken, then he gets one reward.**)) It was agreed upon (by al-Bukhaaree and Muslim).

How often it is that the *imaams* other than him (Ibn Taymiyyah) have different positions on an issue! It is sometimes the case that a scholar has two (contradictory) positions or more ascribed to him in one issue of differing. The books of the scholars are full of this. Ash-Shaafi'ee has two *math-habs* (in some issues), an old one and a new one, and Ahmad has numerous positions in many issues that are well known and have been documented. Aboo Ya'laa has a book about this.

It could even be the case that Ahmad has five positions on one single issue. This is proof of his fear of Allaah and his honest search for the correct position. An honest search from the truth does not prevent a scholar from holding a position today that contradicts the position he held yesterday when it is clear to him that his initial position was mistaken.

For example, he (Ahmad) held five different positions on the issue of declaring the one who abandons the four pillars (of Islaam) to be a disbeliever. Shaykh al-Islaam (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in the *Majmoo'* (7/302):

> The Muslims have reached scholarly consensus over the issue of the one who does not pronounce the testimony of faith being a disbeliever. As for the four actions (pillars), they differed over whether the one who abandons them is a disbeliever or not. And when we say, "*Ahlus-Sunnah* are united over the fact that no one is to be declared a disbeliever because of a sin," then we mean by this: the sins like fornication and drinking intoxicants. But regarding the one who abandons these four pillars, there exists well known differing. Ahmad's position on the issue is itself the subject of dispute. In one narration, he makes *takfeer* of anyone who abandons any one of them. This is the position of Aboo Bakr and a number of Maalikee scholars, like Ibn Habeeb. In a second narration, he would only make *takfeer* of the one who abandons prayer or *zakaah* only. In a third narration, he would only make *takfeer* of the one who abandons the prayer, or *zakaah* if he fights the *imaam* because of it. A fourth position attributed to him is that only the one who abandons the prayer is to be declared a disbeliever. And a fifth position is that whoever abandons all of them (i.e. the four) is not to be declared a disbeliever due to that. And all of these positions are well known and held by the *Salaf*. (Refer to something similar: 7/610-611)

I will add at this time: Aboo Haneefah and his companions prevented the people from praying over the renegades (against the Muslim ruler). This position of theirs destroys the so-called scholarly consensus (claimed by Faalih)!

Imaam Ibn 'Abdil-Barr said in *At-Tamheed* (14/44 of the *Faarooq* printing, 1420):

> They held the position that prayer is to be offered over everyone from the people of the *qiblah* (the Muslims). The majority of the scholars held this position, except for Aboo Haneefah and his companions, they opposed them regarding the renegades (against the Muslim ruler) only, saying, "We do not pray over them since we shun them and stay away from them during their lives." Furthermore, they said, "And especially after their death this should be the case, since there is no hope for them to repent."
>
> Aboo 'Umar (Ibn 'Abdil-Barr) says: This holds no weight. Rather, the majority of the scholars and jurists from the *Hijaaz* and Iraq held that whoever says *Laa ilaaha ill-Allaah* is to be prayed over, be they sinners or upright, be they persistent sinners, or even those who have committed suicide, so long as they have said: *Laa ilaaha ill-Allaah.* However, Maalik opposed them about the prayer over the people of innovations. He disliked it for the *imaams*, but did not prevent the common-folk from it. And Aboo Haneefah opposed them about the prayer over the renegades (against the Muslim ruler). The rest of the scholars, other than Maalik, prayed over the people of desires and innovations, those who committed major sins, the Khawaarij, and others.

So this is the position of Aboo Haneefah and his companions regarding the renegades (against the Muslim ruler). I hope that this relieves the pains and anguish that have come over you regarding those who outwardly actions of disobedience!

And furthermore, we have been, and remain with, the majority of the scholars and jurists who held it to be permissible to pray over any of the people of the *qiblah* (the Muslims) who die, even if they were from the people of innovations or the renegades.

[The Third Point of Contention]

[3]: Faalih says:

> And here you are, dear reader - the exact words from "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah", so you will know the extent of this man's treachery and scheming:
>
> > It is befitting that the people of knowledge and Deen do not pray over those who die and did not used to pay *zakaah* or pray except in Ramadhaan, as a penalty and a punishment for their kind of people. This is understood from when the Prophet

> (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did not pray over the man who killed himself or the man who had debts and had not paid them off. However, some people must pray over them. Furthermore, whoever knows of a hypocrite is not to pray over him, while others who do not know that he is a hypocrite will pray over him.
>
> And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers.
>
> And those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins.
>
> And it is good for people to refrain from praying over any one of these types to set an example for those who are like them and behave like them. It is also fine for someone to pray over one of them, hoping that Allaah will have mercy on him, so long as there is no clear advantage in refraining from the prayer. Moreover, refraining from praying over him outwardly, while inwardly supplicating for him, combines both advantages, and, thus, is more appropriate then doing only one or the other.
>
> And the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam)* did not wash the body of the martyr, nor did he pray over him. This shows that the prayer is not obligatory in the first place. And the recommended nature of not doing something does not prove that it is prohibited.

I (Faalih) say: These words of Shaykh al-Islaam here are clear and in no need of explanation. Prayer is mentioned here due to the invoking of mercy in its supplications. What Shaykh al-Islaam has said here is, "And he inwardly supplicates for him." And supplication is to invoke mercy on someone.

He (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) used to say when supplicating for the deceased, ((**O Allaah! Forgive him and have mercy on him…**)) as found in the *hadeeth*.

I am just astonished at how a Muslim can forbid people from invoking mercy on another Muslim who has not left the fold of Islaam by his sinning and disobedience, while Allaah the Glorified and Exalted has said to His Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) in a clear verse of revelation (what means): **And seek forgiveness for your sin and for the believing men and women**. And from the supplications of the believers is: **O our Lord! Forgive us and our brothers who have preceded us in faith!**

> My brother, look at how al-Madkhalee has combined these words, making the *waaw* ("and") in the statement, "And those who die openly disobedient," a conjunction (i.e. making it connected to what preceded it), while it is supposed to be the beginning of a new sentence, not a conjunction. To dispel the thought that it could be other than a conjunction, he inserted an *alif* in front of the *waaw*, and it became "aw" ("or"), thus misrepresenting the context of these words, "And whoever dies openly disobedient," distorting their connection to the previous words and those after them, causing them to be connected to the statement, "And it is not permissible to invoke mercy on those who die as disbelievers"!!! As a result, it takes the ruling of what preceded (i.e. the one who dies openly disobedient is like the one who dies as a disbeliever)."

Commentary:

It can be said: The quote in its entirety as I conveyed it with every bit of integrity and precision has already preceded, so you may refer to it.

[The Fourth Point of Contention]

[4]: His statement: "I am just astonished at how a Muslim can forbid people from invoking mercy on another Muslim who has not left the fold of Islaam."

Commentary:

The reader knows my position on this issue from my own refutations of Abul-Hasan, and further clarification is to come from my other books and articles.

Faalih knows this. He and others know that I have contended with al-Haddaad and the Haddaadees over the issue of prohibiting people from invoking mercy on the people of innovation in the foolish manner that have used. And (they know that) no one had stepped forth to deal with this issue as I had, and to Allaah is the praise.

Then, the soul of the extreme Haddaadee, 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel, the friend and sworn ally of Faalih, could find no rest. His soul could not rest, nor did he relax or take a breather from waging war against Rabee', stirring the people up against him, and rushing to try and destroy him, as he thought!

So where was his (Faalih's) refutation of the Haddaadees in that issue?! And where were the false tears and this earnest position against the Haddaadiyyah?! And where are the statements of the Faalihites refuting them in this and other issues?!

And then how could you enlist these types as your soldiers in your war against the Salafees (Rabee' being from them), a war built upon lies and wickedness?!!!

Thus, these fake tears of yours are lies. And there is no Rabee' that is prohibiting anyone from invoking mercy upon the people of innovations, nor upon disobedient

Muslims. Rather, he only quoted an opinion of Shaykh al-Islaam that is specific to the disobedient (Muslims) who openly display their disobedience. Nor are you honest in your false tears or your "astonishment." And dear reader, my position on invoking mercy has preceded, and more clarification on that is to come, *in shaa' Allaah*.

[The Fifth Point of Contention]

[5]: Faalih says:

> My brother, look at how al-Madkhalee has combined these words, making the *waaw* ("and") in the statement, "And those who die openly disobedient," a conjunction (i.e. making it connected to what preceded it), while it is supposed to be the beginning of a new sentence, not a conjunction. To dispel the thought that it could be other than a conjunction, he inserted an *alif* in front of the *waaw*, and it became "aw" ("or"), thus misrepresenting the context of these words, "And whoever dies openly disobedient," distorting their connection to the previous words and those after them, causing them to be connected to the statement, "And it is not permissible to invoke mercy on those who die as disbelievers"!!! As a result, it takes the ruling of what preceded (i.e. the one who dies openly disobedient is like the one who dies as a disbeliever).

Commentary:

Firstly, Glorified You are (Allaah), this is a tremendous lie! By the Lord of the heavens and the earth, none of these things that this man has invented against me have ever come to my mind! However, it is not out of the ordinary for him to fall into the likes of these disgraceful doings.

Secondly, I have quoted the words of Ibn Taymiyyah from his book "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah", exactly and precisely, sentence by sentence, word by word, letter by letter, exactly as I found them, in the same context, in regards to what came before these words and what came after. I did not add a single letter, not an *alif*, *hamzah*, or anything else! And within these words of Shaykh al-Islaam was the following paragraph:

"And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers or those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins."

I did not change a single thing, nor did I replace anything with the word "aw" ("or") in this paragraph. The printing that I quoted these words of Shaykh al-Islaam from has this in it, and to Allaah is the praise. It is the printing of *Daar al-'Aasimah*, with the checking of Ahmad al-Khaleel, and with the commentary of al-'Allaamah Ibn 'Uthaymeen (may Allaah have mercy on him). So whoever wants to review it to confirm this and know the reality of the affair, then let him kindly do so.

He says, "Look at how al-Madkhalee has combined these words, making the *waaw* ("and") in the statement, "And those who die openly disobedient," a conjunction (i.e. making it connected to what preceded it), while it is supposed to be the beginning of a new sentence, not a conjunction."

I say: I have not taken any liberties with the words of Shaykh al-Islaam; I have not connected any separate things, nor separated anything connected. Furthermore, there is nothing other than an "aw" ("or") in what I have quoted, not a "waaw" ("and"). And as far as I am concerned, with regard to the context of the speech, it could not be other than a conjunction. Even if it was really a "waaw" ("and"), I could not consider it other than a conjunction, since the context has nothing preventing it from being a conjunction. Even until now, I can see it no other way.

He says:

> To dispel the thought that it could be other than a conjunction, he inserted an *alif* in front of the *waaw*, and it became "aw" ("or"), thus misrepresenting the context of these words, "And whoever dies openly disobedient," distorting their connection to the previous words and those after them, causing them to be connected to the statement, "And it is not permissible to invoke mercy on those who die as disbelievers"!!! As a result, it takes the ruling of what preceded (i.e. the one who dies openly disobedient is like the one who dies as a disbeliever).

I say: I have already discussed its context and its relevance to what precedes it and what comes after it, and that I have not taken any liberties, and that what is actually found is the word "aw" ("or"), exactly. By Allaah, the things this fabricator has invented against me, these wicked accusations, have never crossed my mind! And it is not far fetched for him to do something like this (what he is accusing me of), and thus think that others do the same!

Abul-Hasan al-Misree, with all his wickedness, never stooped to the lowly depths of falsehood that this sinful slanderer has stooped to.

I can only wonder how much time he has spent on this fabrication! And it would not be far-fetched to find that he has actually sought help from other evil, crafty people like himself to fabricate these accusations, those who need to be dealt with legally and punished as a deterrent to prevent them and their likes (from such actions). And how cowardly is Faalih in avoiding legal prosecution, and how deserving he and his sect are to face legal proceedings!!

Faalih says:

> And it is as clear as the sun in the middle of a cloudless mid-morning sky that al-Madkhalee intentionally quoted from "Alikhtiyaaraat" to capitalize on the phrase, "And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers…" It is found just

> like this in "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa" (4/445), and that which is directly before it and after it, from that which carries the same meaning and ruling, shows that it is only a parenthetical clause, and that its meaning is understood from the (other) words of Shaykh al-Islaam. His words become more clear when one refers to his other books that al-Madkhalee played a blind eye to in order to achieve his corrupt goal.

I say: Surely the lying and rumor-spreading is obvious in your own words, as clear as the sun in the middle of the sky! What exactly is your proof that al-Madkhalee intentionally quoted from "Alikhtiyaaraat" to capitalize on the phrase, "And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers"? By Allaah, I never did such a thing, and it had never even come to my mind to do such a thing! And what would lead me to capitalize on such a thing when I hold the position that it is permissible to invoke mercy (on disobedient Muslims or innovators), as is found in my writings, gatherings, and responses to questioners during the war between myself and your Haddaadee cult, as they claimed that it is not permissible to invoke mercy upon an innovator, and declared everyone who did not make *tabdee'* of (certain) innovators to be innovators themselves? And this war of theirs against me and against the Salafee *manhaj* continues to blaze on.

Shaykh al-Islaam held various positions, and the book has been named "Alikhtiyaaraat" ("Chosen Positions"), so is it really impossible that he held a position that opposes that of the majority of the scholars?! Is it impossible that he held a position that others before him held?!

Do you not see that you are ignoring that which is self-evident and obvious, as clear as the sun?!

Shaykh al-Islaam held different positions in some issues. From them is this issue that he (Faalih) has created an uproar about.

And from them is what al-Imaam al-Ba'lee quoted from Shaykh al-Islaam in "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah" (p.137 of *Daar al-'Aasimah*'s printing), "And it was not from the practice of the *Salaf* to pray optional prayers, fast optional fasts, perform optional pilgrimages, or recite the Qur'aan in order to give the reward as a gift to deceased Muslims. **Thus, it is not proper to deviate from the way of the *Salaf*, as it is better and more complete.**"

Al-Ba'lee then said, "**And Abul-'Abbaas (Ibn Taymiyyah) said another** in another place, 'That which is correct is that the deceased can benefit from all physical acts of worship, like prayer, fasting, and reading the Qur'aan, just as he can benefit from financial acts of worship, like charity, freeing slaves, and the likes, by way of scholarly consensus between the *imaams*.'"

Shaykh al-Islaam held two different positions in this one issue. In one of them, according to your methodology, he prevents the deceased Muslims from a great

amount of good that the Muslims who are alive would give them, **in addition to contradicting the consensus of the *imaams*!!**

My position is what the *Salaf* were upon, and I hope that it is the latter of the two positions of Shaykh al-Islaam.

Also, Shaykh al-Islaam (may Allaah have mercy on him) held two different positions on whether al-Khadhir is still alive or not:

- In one position, he held that he is still alive.

- In the other, he firmly opposed that he could be alive.

These things, according to the Haddaadiyyah's *math-hab*, are ghastly contradictions that require us to speak ill of whoever they are attributed to!!

According to the scholars, he was a *mujtahid* who received two rewards when he reached the truth and one reward when he erred.

[The Sixth Point of Contention]

[6]: Faalih says:

> It is found just like this in "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa" (4/445), and that which is directly before it and after it, from that which carries the same meaning and ruling, shows that it is only a parenthetical clause,[2] and that its meaning is understood from the (other) words of Shaykh al-Islaam. His words become more clear when one refers to his other books that al-Madkhalee played a blind eye to in order to achieve his corrupt goal.

Commentary:

Firstly: These words you have referred to are from "Alikhtiyaaraat al-'Ilmiyyah Fikh-tiyaaraat Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah", a book organized by *fiqh* chapters by Al-Imaam Abul-Hasan 'Alee ibn Muhammad ibn 'Abbaas al-Ba'lee ad-Dimashqee, and its exact wording is as follows:

> It is befitting that the people of knowledge and *Deen* do not pray over those who die and did not used to pay *zakaah* or pray except in Ramadhaan, as a penalty and a punishment for their kind of people. This is understood from when the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did not pray over the man who killed himself, the man who

[2] Parenthetical clauses (*I'tiraadh*) are used for elaboration and have a number of specific purposes, like: (1) Glorifying or exalting someone or something; (2) Supplications; (3). Commentary; or (4) Adding emphasis to a point. Sometimes they are only a single sentence, and sometimes they are many sentences. So which kind of parenthetical clause is this that you are claiming?!!

> stole from the war booty before its distribution, **or the man who had debts and had paid them off.** However, some people must pray over them. Furthermore, if someone was a hypocrite, like those whose hypocrisy is known, then he is not to be prayed over. And whoever's hypocrisy is not known is to be prayed over. And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers, and those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins. And it is good for people to refrain from praying over any one of these types to set an example for those who are like him and behave like him. Moreover, refraining from praying over him outwardly, while inwardly supplicating for him, in order to combine both advantages, is more appropriate then doing only one or the other. And the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did not wash the body of the martyr, nor did he pray over him. This shows that the prayer is not obligatory in the first place. And the recommended nature of not doing something does not prove that it is prohibited.

When comparing between this and what is found in the printing of the book I have quoted from previously, the one that is better due to its being produced from three different manuscripts and a fourth one having commentary by al-'Allaamah ibn 'Uthaymeen (may Allaah have mercy on him), the one that has been checked thoroughly like no other printing of this book…

When comparing between what is found in "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa" and what is in this distinguished printing, we find the following inconsistencies and omissions in the text of "al-Fataawaa":

[1]: In the wording of "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa": " This is understood from when the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did not pray over the man who killed himself, the man who stole from the war booty before its distribution, **nor the man who had debts and <u>had paid</u> them off.**

The phrase, "Nor the man who had debts and had paid them off," is something that clearly renders the meaning invalid, as clear as the sun, but you did not catch this!

In the better printing that has the commentary of al-'Allaamah Ibn 'Uthaymeen (p.131): **"Nor the man who had debts and <u>had not</u> paid them off."** This is the correct meaning.

Furthermore, in "Majmoo' al-Fataawaa" (24/286): **"Nor <u>over</u> the man who had debts and <u>had not</u> paid them off."** This meaning is correct, and it has the added word: "over".

[2]: In "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa" more than an entire line is omitted: **"It is also fine for someone to pray over one of them, hoping that Allaah will have mercy on him, so long as there is no clear advantage in refraining from the prayer."**

[3]: In the wording of "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa": "**And those who die openly disobedient**," with a "waaw" ("and"). In the printing I have quoted from: "Or those who die openly disobedient."

Scholastic verification of the text would require one to rely on the printing that I have quoted from and spoken of, the one that is better than the others due to it being based on three different manuscripts and a fourth one that has been spoken about, along with the fact that the printing of "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa" is inferior in its printing and its checking. Any intelligent person can tell how inferior the checking is and would know that it is not to be relied upon when there is some differing over the wording. In this case, there are two omissions in a small excerpt. Thus, it is quite possible that the *alif* from the word "aw" ("or") was omitted, causing the word to read: "wa" ("and").

And what is amazing is that you have made this your proof, while you did not even notice that the text you are using is full of errors. You attack (me) with it, strolling around on your high-horse, declaring the trustworthy to be treacherous.

Does this reckless logic of yours also require you to accuse the checker of "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa"?!

Furthermore, when comparing between Shaykh Muhammad Haamid al-Faqee's printing and the better one, we find in Muhammad Haamid's printing: **"And for someone to pray over one of them, hoping for Allaah's mercy,"** and in the better printing: **"And for someone to pray over one of them, hoping that Allaah will have mercy on him."**

So what should we say about Shaykh Muhammad Haamid since his printing omits the word "lahu" (causing the difference in meaning found in the two previously mentioned passages)?!

Moreover, what should we say about him, while the checker of the better printing has said that his (Muhammad Haamid's) printing hardly has a page in it free of an error, omission, or altered words?! He said this on page "w" of his introduction. And on page "z":

> **A.** There is often a missing line or more, and there are many examples of this. (He went on to mention some of them.)
>
> **B.** It is very common to find a missing word or two. You can hardly find a page without this.
>
> **C.** The meanings are often distorted.

What would the verdict on Shaykh Muhammad Haamid be in the court of the Haddaadees?! And just how many gavels would come crashing down upon his head?!

The scholars, intellectuals, and noble people, on the other hand, will find an excuse for him and invoke mercy upon him, especially since he only had one hand-written

manuscript to rely upon, and they will not forget his efforts (may Allaah have mercy on him) in serving and defending the Sunnah.

Secondly: What is your evidence that Shaykh al-Islaam actually wrote this word with a "waaw" ("and") that you describe as being the beginning of a new sentence, and that Rabee' has boldly come and lied and betrayed by writing it as an "aw" ("or")?!

Don't the "intellectuals" believe it to be possible that the mistake is actually from "al-Fataawaa al-Kubraa"?!

Thirdly: How is it that you can speak so decisively, saying that Rabee' is the one who has distorted these words, and then build rulings upon that, leading the intelligent people to invoke mercy upon Mahmood al-Haddaad who fell short of reaching what the new leader of the Haddaadees, Faalih al-Harbee, has reached?

Fourthly: You have said, "Its meaning is understood from the (other) words of Shaykh al-Islaam."

I say: This is a claim of recklessness and obstinacy, and no one who knows the Arabic language could possibly understand what you are claiming about the words of Shaykh al-Islaam that I have quoted. The only thing a person can understand is the same thing I have understood. What precedes it and what comes after it has no proof in it for what you are claiming, nor is there any proof in its meaning or ruling.

Fifthly: You say, "His words become more clear when one refers to his other books that al-Madkhalee played a blind eye to in order to achieve his corrupt goal."

I say: On what grounds do say that I have played a blind eye to the books of Shaykh al-Islaam in order to achieve a corrupt goal?!

And on what grounds do you say that I knew this sentence was a parenthetical clause and then intentionally caused it to be understood in a way that is not linguistically possible, ignoring the books of Shaykh al-Islaam, so as to preserve the falsehood of the meaning that I invented (as you believe) against Shaykh al-Islaam?

When I was refuting Abul-Hasan, I was going through a cassette tape of his, commenting on the oppression and false claims I found on it. This tape was not a manuscript I was checking, referring to other copies and comparing them (i.e. it was not something easy), especially when there were discrepancies. I could mention other books like this as well.

Have you ever done something like that? Show me your respectable efforts and your precise verifications of texts, O precise *muhaqqiq*!!

I say to you: From your chameleon-like changing of colors is that you were with the Salafees in refuting those who hold the principle of *Mujmal* and *Mufassal*.[3]

[3] **Translator:** Understanding *mujmal* (ambigious words) in light of *mufassal* (specific elaboration) is a principle to be applied absolutely only to the texts of the Book and

Afterwards, oppression, wrongdoing, and wickedness in argumentation have led you to join the sect of Sayyid Qutb in holding to the principle of *Mujmal* and *Mufassal*. So if this is truly your way now, then why have you not understood my ambiguous words in light of my elaboration in other places?! If your soul refuses to do that, then why invent all these lies against me, while you have become from those who hold to the principle of *Mujmal* and *Mufassal*? And what exactly is the benefit you and others get from a principle that you view as something of truth and justice, the first of those who benefit from it are the people of innovations, while you yourselves do not implement this form of justice?

Islaam commands us to deal justly between the Muslims, and between the disbelievers of the Jews, Christians, Magians, etc. as well.

May Allaah destroy the vain desires (that people follow)! How corrupting they are! And how dangerous they are to their possessors firstly, and then to others as well! And how often Allaah exposes their realities and the truth of what they conceal and cover up!

[The Seventh Point of Contention]

[7]: Faalih, the great *muhaqqiq*, says, "And even he has referred to these words and quoted them and others from it, while the author of the book "Mawqif Ahlis-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah min Ahlil-Ahwaa' wal-Bida'" has not said this. Al-Madkhalee has read it, quoted it, and referred the reader to it."[4]

Commentary:

Firstly: At this time I would like to mention that Faalih has changed colors so many times with regards to his stance on this book. He speaks ill of the book and its author, then apologizes and goes back to praising him and his book. It has even been mentioned to me that he has given lessons from the book.

Then, he goes back to attacking the book and its author, labeling him an innovator. So I do not even know which color he is (i.e. for or against the book) at this time?!

Secondly: Yes, I referred to this book, quoting the relevant things I needed from it. I also referred to the book of Shaykh al-Islaam, quoting its exact words, so what exactly are you seeking from me? Do you require that I review all of Shaykh al-Islaam's books, and study their origins (i.e. manuscripts) and the origins of the origins of the origins of all quotes in them, all the way back to the time of Imaam Maalik, al-Awzaa'ee, ath-Thawree, just to comment on a cassette tape?!!

---

the Sunnah. What is being refuted here is applying this to the speech of innovators, in order to defend their mistakes and understand them in a good light.

[4] These words of his referring to this book is a proof that he has intentionally omitted the imaams' words that prove the futility of the claim of scholarly consensus. So who is the treacherous one?!

We would like to see clear efforts from yourself along these lines, so you could be an example for the *Ummah* to follow.

[The Eighth Point of Contention]

[8]: Faalih says:

> And the words of Shaykh al-Islaam as found in *Majmoo' al-Fataawaa* (24/286) are:
>
> > And the people who are openly disobedient, while they have some *eemaan*, like those who commit major sins, must be prayed over by some of the Muslims. Whoever withheld from paying over one of them, as a penalty to those like him who behave similarly, as the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) did when he refrained from praying over the one who killed himself, the one who stole from the war booty before its distribution, and the one who had unpaid debts.
> >
> > And as many of the Salaf did, not praying over the people of innovations. Then acting in accordance with this Sunnah is a good practice…
> >
> > …And if someone prays over one of them, seeking Allaah's mercy (for them), while there is no clear advantage in refraining from the prayer, then this is good.
> >
> > And to withhold from praying over him openly, while inwardly supplicating for him, so as to combine the two benefits, is attaining both advantages, and it is more appropriate than doing one or the other.
>
> Look at how he has yanked these words right out of their context, an extreme display of treachery! And then he added an "alif" from himself before the "waaw", so it became "aw" ("or"). Allaah is sufficient for us, and for Shaykh al-Islaam, and it suffices us for our Islaam and our *Ummah* that He will deal with the evil of those who toy with the words of the people of knowledge, making additions and omissions, attributing things to them they are free of.

Commentary:

Verily this man is brilliant when it comes to trumping up accusations! After he gathers these things from the books of Shaykh al-Islaam, he goes on to accuse Rabee' of treachery and lies, etc.

Based on this line of thinking, the very first person who should be accused with these things is the checker of the book "Ikhtiyaaraat Ibn Taymiyyah", or even the compiler

of the book (al-Ba'lee) who only mentioned one position in this issue and had not referred to the other books of Shaykh al-Islaam. Moreover, based on your *manhaj*, he has committed a crime against Shaykh al-Islaam, since he authored a book about his different positions on issues and left out other positions!!

Furthermore, these accusations should be directed toward Muhammad Haamid al-Faqee, since he did not refer to the other books of Shaykh al-Islaam like "Al-Minhaaj". And Ibn 'Uthaymeen should be accused as well, since he came across these words and saw this dangerous "aw" ("or") and did not refer to the other books of Shaykh al-Islaam, so as to uproot this destructive word from its place, and to replace it with the merciful "waaw" ("and"), the "waaw" of the Haddaadees who have gone from being a blazing inferno against this *Ummah* to a group advocating peace and mercy. This change of direction is found in the words of their merciful leader who is overwhelmingly compassionate to the *Ummah*, and the only harshness he ever shows is for the Salafees, so he is to be excused!

[The Ninth Point of Contention]

[9]: Faalih says, shedding fake tears over his "waaw" ("and"), the "waaw" that begins a new sentence, and over the oppressed quote taken by Rabee' from its proper context, "Look at how he has yanked these words right out of their context, an extreme display of deception! And then he added an "alif" from himself before the "waaw", so it became "aw" ("or")."

Commentary:

What a great catastrophe against the Islaam of the Haddaadees and their *Ummah* there is in these actions of Rabee'. He has become an enemy to the *Ummah* by taking this quote out of context and adding an oppressive "alif" to it, overtaking the "waaw" ("and") and changing it into a an "aw" ("or"). If only the Rawaafidh or the Soofiyyah knew what has come upon this "waaw", they would have organized a wake, constructed graves and other structures for it, and declared war on the word "aw" ("or"), or at least the "alif" in it, and announced their hatred for it!!!

It is a must that I excuse myself from this in front of the people and say: Verily I am innocent of what Faalih is accusing me of, and the perpetrator here, who is most deserving of this accusation is 'Alaa' ad-Deen al-Ba'lee, Ibn 'Uthaymeen, and the checker of the book who all approved of it (the presence of the "aw"), so please address your arguments and accusations to them! As for me, (I swear) by Allaah I have taken no liberties when I quoted these words, nor have I extracted any words from their true context. I have not taken a single letter out of its context, nor have I added a single letter to it, not an *alif*, nor anything else.

I further believe that 'Alaa' ad-Deen al-Ba'lee and those who came after him had not taken any liberties with the words of Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, not with regards to an *alif* or anything else. I would like to give the people some tranquility, and Faalih as well, in the middle of this catastrophe, by saying:

There is actually no difference between an "aw" ("or") and a "waaw" ("and") in the context of these words. Both of them are conjunctions. They are sisters and have no differences or disputes between them.

So let Faalih excuse me if I have said that he is mistaken in his conviction that the "waaw" ("and") here is the beginning of a new sentence. I say to him now: If it truly is "waaw alibtidaa'", a "waaw" that begins a new sentence, then where is the conclusion of the sentence that begins with the word "man" ("whoever") that comes after it?!

And if the "waaw" ("and") does not mark the beginning of the sentence in this case, and it was replaced by an "aw" ("or"), then where is the rest of the sentence?![5]

So that the futility of what Faalih has said becomes perfectly clear for the people to see, I repeat the words as said by Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allaah have mercy on him): "And it is not permissible for anyone to invoke mercy upon those who die as disbelievers or those who die openly disobedient, even while they have some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins."

When we understand the phrase, "Or those who die openly disobedient," to be connected to what precedes it, then the meaning is correct, and thus it carries the ruling of what comes before it (i.e. it is not permissible to invoke mercy upon those who die openly disobedient).

If we were to understand it as a phrase that begins a new idea, having no relation to what precedes it or what comes after it, then it becomes a bunch of meaningless words. We hold Shaykh al-Islaam in higher esteem than that.

And if we understood it to be connected to what comes after it, then the meaning would be: "And whoever died openly disobedient, while still having some *eemaan*, like the people who commit major sins, and whoever refrains from praying over one of them as a penalty for his kind who behave similarly, then this is good."

To say that "whoever refrains (from the prayer)" is joined in meaning to the phrase, "whoever dies openly disobedient," would imply falsehood, including a justification of sinning and an encouragement to sin. No Muslim would ever think of such a thing. Thus, the only way these words can be understood properly is that the phrase is joined in meaning to what precedes it, and that this is just one of the positions that Shaykh al-Islaam actually held (may Allaah have mercy on him).

Whatever he mentioned in other books that opposes this opinion is possibly an indication that he gave up this view, as other scholars and *mujtahids* of this *Ummah* have done – they hold a position until another appears to be more correct, then they retract the first one.

---

[5] **Translator:** The English reader who has not studied Arabic grammar is not expected to fully understand the line of argument here.

Faalih has worked very hard, going against his normal habits and what he is used to (of laziness), or perhaps someone else worked very hard on his behalf, using computer databases to gather the words of Shaykh al-Islaam from "Majmoo' al-Fataawaa" and "Minhaaj as-Sunnah" to establish that Rabee' has behaved treacherously and misquoted him, and all those other attacks and accusations. And how truly distant are his efforts from sincerity of purpose towards Islaam and the Muslims.

When pondering over what he and others have quoted, it appears that Shaykh al-Islaam used to speak about this affair in specific contexts. Sometimes he would speak about this affair in his response to a question. Other times he would begin speaking on this topic, as is found in "Alikhtiyaaraat" and "Majmoo' al-Fataawaa" (24/288-289). Sometimes he would speak about this affair while refuting the people of desires, as is found in "al-Minhaaj".

His speech would vary in its wording, structure, and length in these different circumstances.

This *fatwaa* that I have quoted word for word from the book "Alikhtiyaaraat al-Fiqhiyyah" is only one of them. His position, based on his words, is exactly as I have mentioned, and I have not changed a single letter as Faalih has falsely claimed. ❨ **And their testimony will be written down and they will be questioned** (about it) ❩.

Furthermore, I should not fail to mention here that Faalih is using a source that has omissions in it as a proof against me, as I have explained in what has preceded. He also has omitted the word "lahu" ("for him") from the quote which came before “Allaah’s mercy”, "And whoever prays over him seeking Allaah's mercy <u>for him</u>." This has changed the sentence to mean that the one who prays seeks mercy for himself, not the deceased.

According to his own *math-hab*, this is treachery and preventing people from seeking mercy for the deceased!!

On the other hand, according to the people of knowledge, this is a simple mistake that does not allow affect the integrity of the person who quoted the material, nor could he be charged with treachery. So what then is the opinion of Faalih and the Haddaadees?

The reply: If he is a true Haddaadee, then it is no problem, even if he was to misquote entire pages treacherously and on purpose!!

And if he is not from amongst the Haddaadees, then he is a treacherous liar, even if he omitted a single word by mistake. He would even be called treacherous if he committed no errors at all, intentionally or unintentionally! So take a lesson from this, O people of understanding!

[The Tenth Point of Contention]

[10]: Faalih says:

> And along with this, al-Madkhalee, with this behavior of his, has committed a heinous crime against Shaykh al-Islaam, attributing to him a stance contradictory to what the *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* have reached a consensus over, and a belief that contradicts their beliefs, resulting from the liberties he took with the words of Shaykh al-Islaam and his lies, along with a number of other calamities and crimes. This is not the time to expound on them, however, that is to come *in shaa' Allaah*. This action of his shows two things:
>
> Firstly, it shows that this man is not trustworthy in what he quotes and attributes to the people of knowledge. He truncates their words, adds to them, and omits things from them in a way that fits his needs and suits his desires. This is something that strengthens the argument that he is actually the author of "al-Manshoor", since they both have the same behavior and the same way of doing things.

Commentary:

This is how Faalih speaks, with every bit of courage and bravery! However, the reality is that everything he has said is an explicit lie:

[A]: Indeed he has seen my words that include the *hadeeth* of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) prohibiting the visitation of their sick (the Qadarees') and taking part in their funeral prayers. It was collected by al-Imaam Ahmad (2/125), Ibn Maajah (1/35, #192), Ibn Abee 'Aasim in "As-Sunnah" (p.144), and al-Aajurree in "ash-Sharee'ah" (190-191). As-Sindee quoted al-Haafith Ibn Hajr's authentication of it, and al-Albaanee graded it *hasan* in "Thilaal al-Jannah" (p.144) and "Saheeh Ibn Maajah" (1/22).

[B]: From the *imaams* that prohibited people from praying over the Qadariyyah are: Ibn 'Abbaas, Ibn 'Umar, Mujaahid, Maalik, al-Layth, and Aboo Thawr. Refer to "Mawqif Ahlis-Sunnah min Ahlil-Bida'" of ar-Ruhaylee (1/413), as he has mentioned other sources as well.

Bishr ibn al-Haarith said about the Jahmiyyah, "Do not sit with them, do not speak with them, do not visit them if they become sick, and do not attend (their funeral prayers) if they die. ["As-Sunnah" of 'Abdullaah ibn Ahmad, 1/126]

Muhammad ibn Yahyaa al-'Adanee said, "Whoever says that the Qur'aan is created is a disbeliever, and he is not be prayed over… their funerals are not be attended, and their sick are not to be visited." [Al-Laalakaa'ee, 1/325] Also, refer to my treatise: "I'aanatu Abil-Hasan" (p.14-15).

Faalih has seen these words himself. This is known since he mentioned that I have referred to the book of ar-Ruhaylee "Mawqif Ahlis-Sunnah min Ahlil-Bida'",

however, he hid this and contradicted what is in it to claim that Rabee' has attributed something to Shaykh al-Islaam that contradicts what *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* have reached a consensus over, and a belief that opposes their beliefs. You have come to know about his lie in this affair 100%. The reality of this claim of his is that Ibn 'Abbaas, Ibn 'Umar, Mujaahid, Maalik, al-Layth, Aboo Thawr, and all those who relayed the narrations about the Qadariyyah, like Ahmad, Ibn Maajah, Ibn Abee 'Aasim, and 'Abdullaah ibn Ahmad, are not from *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*, since neither they nor their positions are given any consideration in this issue, or that they have opposed the consensus of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, if he even considers them from them.

[C]: I request that he brings his proof of these calamities, wrongdoings, and betrayals. I do not know how many there are. If he is unable to do that, then the people should know about his fabrications, and that he is the one with the calamities, wrongdoings, and betrayals.

Have you forgotten all your false principles you founded, the extremely harsh rulings you dished out to innocent people or those with mistakes?! You went wild in your ruling on one of them, saying that he had rejected the Qur'aan and the Sunnah, and that he had rejected Islaam!

And you say, "So and So is a polytheist!! And So and So is a heretic!!"

And how many lies have you forged lies against *Ahlus-Sunnah*, their scholars and callers?!!

And you passed a verdict on a professor that he destroyed all the messages of the Prophets and all the books that were revealed to them!! This was only because he did not blindly follow you in your *fatwaa* about on voting. Reflect over these issues and others, and then see: Have you repented from any of them? Or are you just increasing in calamities and wrongdoing?

[D]: What exactly do you want by mentioning these two things: "Firstly, it shows that this man is not trustworthy in what he quotes and attributes to the people of knowledge. He truncates their words…"? And what do you want with your quote from Ibn al-Mubaarak, and another from al-Mu'allimee against al-Kawtharee? Do you want to destroy my books, efforts, and articles that clarify the *'aqeedah* and *manhaj* of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* and expose the beliefs and methodologies of the people of innovations and misguidance, getting revenge for them, after having been an firm advocate in favor of my books and writings? Now you speak against them and discard their author, saying that he is not trustworthy in what he quotes, etc.?

Point of benefit: Doesn't the statement of Huthayfah (may Allaah be pleased with him) fit you quite well now: **"Verily misguidance, true misguidance, is that you support what you used to detest, and that you detest what you used to support"**??

And doesn't this lame and reckless stance of yours show that you have made yourself into a scale (of justice) – whoever agrees with you is truthful and trustworthy, and whoever opposes you becomes a treacherous criminal that is to be warned against, including his books?!

Is someone who behaves in such a way to be considered trustworthy and upright according to the people?!! You have actually made yourself to be from the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel*, like Yahyaa ibn Sa'eed al-Qattaan, 'Abdur-Rahmaan ibn Mahdee, Maalik, Ahmad ibn Hanbal, or Yahyaa ibn Ma'een?!!

Or is it that the intellectuals pay no mind to his words, and he only becomes more despicable to them, especially when they have come to know of his lies? He has become infamous for his lies and severe oppression of innocent people in his verdicts against them.

The trials you have put Salafiyyah and the Salafees through are severe ones indeed! And if your calamities and lies were only restricted to what is contained in this one article, it would be sufficient to nullify your integrity, and *Ahlus-Sunnah* would cast you aside like a date seed, freeing themselves from your atrocities that have misrepresented the Sunnah and its people.

Have you no shame that you quote the words of the scholars about lying and liars and apply them to the furthest of the people from lying, the sternest of the people in warning against it, and the people who truly hate lying and liars the most?

And you forget your own self and that you are a liar, established by the testimony of trustworthy people, and by your own reckless statements and rulings, an example of which is this disgraceful article of yours.

From the words of the previous Prophets: **"If you have no shame, then do as you wish."**

And as the Arabs used to say, **"She accused me of her own illness, and then slipped away."**

[The Eleventh Point of Contention]

[11]: Faalih says:

> And let the people who take this way know that Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, encompasses them and exposes their affair.
>
> Sufyaan said, **"Allaah never screened anyone who lied when narrating *hadeeth*."**
>
> And 'Abdur-Rahmaan ibn Mahdee said, **"If a man even considered lying when narrating *hadeeth*, Allaah would ruin his reputation."**

> And Ibn al-Mubaarak said, **"If a man intended in the last hours of the night to lie when narrating *hadeeth*, by the morning the people would be saying, 'So and so is a liar.'"**

Commentary:

He quotes these words about liars and lying to make the people think that he is from those who wage war against lying, and that his opponents are lying. From this is the lying and betrayal that he has attributed to Rabee' that you have witnessed. It has become clear to you that Rabee' is far from and free of what Faalih, the audacious liar, has attributed to him.

Shouldn't Faalih apply these texts to his own self and realize that he deserves them more than his opponents!

He says, "Al-Mu'allimee said, commenting on these reports, 'The intended meaning here is that whoever can not be trusted to stay clear of intentional misquoting, adding, or omitting things, in any manner whatsoever, is not considered as having *'adaalah* (integrity).'"

I say: Then what is the case when Faalih, and this has been proven with evidences, has intentionally lied and behaved treacherously? What does he say about himself – Does he have integrity? And should he be trusted with any affair, religious or worldly?!!

He also says, "If it is feared that someone may be overtaken by a set of desires…[6] by intentionally lying or distorting something, then he can not be trusted to not have another set of desires overtake him another time, even if he does not sense it."

I say: Then what is the case when desires have truly overcome Faalih, and he has intentionally lied and behaved treacherously? And if al-Mu'allimee or other scholars had seen his actions, how would they have judged him?

[The Twelfth Point of Contention]

[12]: Faalih says, commenting on the words of al-Mu'allimee, "And this is the case of this man (Rabee'), and Allaah is the One whose help is sought."!!

---

6 Regarding his statement, **"If it is feared that someone may be overtaken by desires one time… by intentionally lying or distorting something, then he can not be trusted to not have his desires overtake him another time, even if he does not sense it,"** Faalih has missed an entire sentence in the middle (!): **"and thus causes him to (intentionally lie…)"** This is either a serious error or a dangerous act of treachery **according the Haddaadee *math-hab***. If the people were to believe in this *manhaj*, they would break their pens in fear of falling into the likes of this!! You must refer to "At-Tankeel" (1/48) of Shaykh al-Mu'allimee, may Allaah have mercy on him.

Commentary:

Rather this is your case and the case of 'Abdul-Lateef, who omitted about six pages of the words of al-Albaanee in praise of the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhaab and the country governed by the Su'ood Family, while holding that al-Albaanee was an enemy to Imaam Muhammad, due to a single statement he uttered regarding al-Bannaa on one of his tapes, and due to another statement when al-Albaanee referred to Imaam Muhammad as "Shaykh al-Islaam #2" after Ibn Taymiyyah, except that they were not equal in their focus on *hadeeth*. How plentiful was al-Albaanee's praise of Imaam Muhammad and his *da'wah*, and how often he defended him! So much so, that all the people of innovation together had all launced their arrows from one united bow, since he was a "Wahhaabee" to them!

So this ruling of his is not being applied to Faalih's friend, even when he has done something like this. Furthermore, he has a book that he falsely named, "al-Fat-hur-Rabbaanee" ("The Divine Victory"), wherein he lied against Rabee' and his brothers amongst the Salafees, calling them a secret and dangerous sect founded upon the erroneous *manhaj* of al-Albaanee! In it, he played with Rabee's words and made many false claims against him.

The noble reader has now come to know of the lies of Faalih as found in this article. With all of this, he has no shame to apply words against liars and lying to the freest and furthest of Allaah's servants from lying.

This is truly from the most astonishing of affairs!!

[The Thirteenth Point of Contention]

[13]: Faalih says, "And al-Mu'allimee said in the beginning of Tankeel" (p.46) when speaking about al-Kawtharee: 'I say: **The true worth of a scholar is honesty, and whoever makes it permissible to distort (a quote from someone) just one time, in a way that aids his opinion, it is feared that he would distort other texts as well**."

Commentary:

So then what would be the case if al-Mu'allimee had seen Faalih, intentionally committing acts of lying and treachery many times, distorting texts to correspond with his corrupt opinion?!

[The Fourteenth Point of Contention]

[14]: Faalih says:

> And he also said (p.51): "And from his dangerous errors is his picking and choosing from the words of the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel*, selecting only the part that fits his purpose, while it occurs that what he does not use at times clarifies that the meaning he constructed is not

> something that could be understood from the words if they were left in their original construction." Then he (may Allaah have mercy on him) mentioned many examples from the words of al-Kawtharee to support this.

Commentary:

What is more atrocious than these dangerous errors is what Faalih has done. He has spoken ill of the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel* and of some of their principles. And here he is, picking and choosing from my words, even hiding some of them, in order to promote his corrupt opinion.

[The Fifteenth Point of Contention]

[15]: Faalih says, "Then, he (al-Mu'allimee) further stated, 'And from his dangerous errors is that he intentionally criticizes (a narrator) with what is not established, relaying it in a way that makes it seem established, and then using it as a proof.' And he went on to mention examples of that."

Then, having no shame about his actions, quoting these words that do not apply in any way to his opponent, while he and his sect are more deserving of them, Faalih comments:

> I say: I do know what al-Mu'allimee would have said about Rabee' and his followers if he had come across their playing with the words of the people of knowledge, as I have explained,[7] would Rabee' deserve the title of the *imaam* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel* according to al-Mu'allimee, or *Rabee'us-Sunnah*, or "an-Naasih as-Saadiq", or would he deserve a different nickname altogether?

Commentary:

Rabee' does not like to be described with any of these descriptions, however, does he deserve to be described with lying, treachery, distorting texts? And does a Salafee who has any respect for Salafiyyah warn against what he quotes?!! Especially considering that what Rabee' quotes is something that serves the Salafee *manhaj* and defends it and its people? The opponents of the Salafee *da'wah* have tried hard to find something wrong in what he quotes, and they have not been able to, and to Allaah, the Most High, is all praise.

I believe that they (the enemies of the da'wah), with all their disputing, have not stooped to the depths that Faalih has stooped to with his bold lies and labeling others as liars, and that they have some degree of shyness and integrity that Faalih does not have.

---

[7] **Translator:** Shaykh Rabee' points out a violation of basic Arabic grammar that Faalih falls into here, and then says, **"Whatever the case, his words are diseased in both their roots and their meanings."**

Furthermore, I say: What would al-Mu'allimee say about Faalih and his sect as they belittle the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel*, believing that they are not qualified to make rulings on the people of innovation, because *tabdee'* (identifying someone as an innovator) is for the scholars who are firmly grounded in knowledge and capable of making rulings, etc., including his other attacks on them and his rebellion against their principles in *Jarh* and *Ta'deel*, saying about some of them that they have misguided the *Ummah*.

Had al-Mu'allimee come across my writings that aid the Sunnah, he would have supported them, just as his brothers from the *imaams* of the Sunnah have done, especially his friend al-Albaanee.

And I also say: What would al-Mu'allimee have said about Faalih and his Haddaadee sect who attack the scholars of the Sunnah and *Tawheed*, those who subdue innovations, the likes of Shaykh an-Najmee, Shaykh Zayd ibn Muhammad Haadee, Shaykh Rabee' ibn Haadee, Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree, Shaykh Saalih as-Suhaymee, Shaykh Muhammad ibn Haadee, and others upon the Salafee *manhaj* in Makkah, al-Madeenah, Jeddah, Riyadh, Sharqiyyah, Yemen, Algeria, Morocco, and other places?

What would al-Mu'allimee say? And what would Ibn Baaz, al-Albaanee, Ibn 'Uthaymeen, and those before them say about Faalih and his Haddaadee sect who invent lies against the Salafee *manhaj* and its scholars and their books, running the people away from it with this lying and misrepresentation?

The answer: They would have held a position against Faalih and his sect, a position more staunch than their position against al-Kawtharee, since Faalih and his sect are more ignorant and more deceitful than al-Kawtharee. At least al-Kawtharee was recognized as having knowledge by al-Mu'allimee and al-Albaanee.

They testified against him that he distorted (texts), however, he did not reach the level of Faalih in the recklessness of his lying. And lying is enough of an innovation, especially when it is against *Ahlus-Sunnah* and their *manhaj* and books.

[The Sixteenth Point of Contention]

[16]: Faalih says, "These people have not understood the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*."

Commentary:

By "these people who have not understood the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*" he means Rabee' and the modern-day scholars of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, those who do not support him in his falsehoods. Even those who he is trying to hide behind, he looks at them with true disdain and absolute contempt, speaking ill of the knowledge of this one and the creed and this *manhaj* of this one. So here he is today, attacking their beliefs.

Look, dear brother, and realize the difference between Faalih and those he attacks. They have books that call to the Salafee creed and defend it. Faalih has no books to be mentioned. In fact, when he stepped forth claiming to have knowledge, he fell flat on his face, attacking *Ahlus-Sunnah* and lying on them. Look at his statements that have been gathered for him in his book "al-Musaara'ah" and the establishment of false principles and his tightrope, oppressive rulings in it. Look at just the beginning of his book that has been at his side for a year or more. Look at the lies, treachery, war on *Ahlus-Sunnah*, and misrepresentation of the Salafee books of *Rabee*, books that Allaah benefited the Sunnah and its people through them. He misrepresents them to keep people from the truth and to turn them towards misguidance.

[The Seventeenth Point of Contention]

[17]: Faalih says, "If the man only knew the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, then he would not have played around with this quote in a way that causes it to carry a meaning contradictory to the consensus of *Ahlus-Sunnah*."

Commentary:

So according to him, Rabee' is ignorant of the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah*. If he is truly ignorant of the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, then he would be even more ignorant of other affairs of Islaam. Most likely, he views the rest of the scholars of *Ahlus-Sunnah* likewise. Thus, al-Albaanee is ignorant of the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, since he holds the position of *irjaa'*, and others as well, like Ibn 'Uthaymeen, who "does not even know what comes out of his head," and according to Faalih, he was "insane"!!

And had he investigated al-Mu'allimee, he would have found him to be from the most ignorant of people – based on this *math-hab* of his – and if any scholar errs then he is ignorant, according to him, based on this *manhaj* and these principles.

Faalih would be a liar to say other than this. When he wants to bring down a scholar, he begins by butchering and accusing him of ignorance. And as for what he has accused me of, toying with the words of Shaykh al-Islaam to make the meaning contradict scholarly consensus, then the response to this tale has already preceded.

I add to that: Shaykh al-Islaam himself said:

> **The scholarly consensus that is most often claimed is normally based on not knowing of an opposing position. We have found even from the greatest of scholars those who would hold the position (claiming scholarly consensus) in some issues, and the only evidence they could cling to was that they did not know of an opposing position, even when the apparent evidences in the issue seemed to prove otherwise. However, it is not possible for a scholar to invent a new position on an issue when he does not know anyone who ever held that position, while knowing that the people have held an opposing position. Some of them would even**

> **make their position conditional, saying, "If there is scholarly consensus in the issue, then it has more right to be followed, otherwise, my position is such and such."**

Refer to: *Raf'ul-Malaam 'anil-A'immatil-A'laam* (40-41/T5, *al-Jaami'ah al-Islaamiyyah*)

And this issue of ours has the most right of any issue to have the claim of scholarly consensus over it rejected. This is clear to those who think and judge fairly.

[The Eighteenth Point of Contention]

[18]: Faalih says:

> Their gross errors are from Allaah shedding light upon their situation, and this is why they are being exposed and disgraced. If *Ahlus-Sunnah* find words attributed to an *imaam* from *Ahlus-Sunnah* that seem to include a contradiction to their creed, they make it the source of an intense study, investigating it from all possible angles, since they know that the likes of these (words) do not come from the likes of these (*imaams*). This is what I have done. When I read what this person named "an-Naasih as-Saadiq" quoted from the words of the people of knowledge, I knew that these words as they have been quoted do not come from their likes. When I referred to their sources to check them, I found things that make one's skin crawl, things that make upright souls nauseated. This is one of the reasons his games have been exposed.
>
> Similarly, when I read what Rabee' had attributed to Shaykh al-Islaam, that he held the position that it is not permissible to invoke mercy upon those who die openly disobedient, I knew for surety that Shaykh al-Islaam would not possibly have said something like that, since it goes against what he himself has explained in detail, and it even goes against the consensus of *Ahlus-Sunnah*.

Commentary:

These "errors" that are from Allaah shedding light on Rabee' and everyone else who opposes Faalih in anything are things that the "insightful and proficient scholars of *Ahlus-Sunnah*" have set out to confront – and who are they exactly? They are the great Haddaadees, Faalih and his sect, the ones who have raised the banner of the Sunnah in the face of Rabee' and those with him who oppose Imaam Faalih!!

Thus, you see that no one other than this greatly proficient *imaam* and his cult stepped forth to attack Rabee', an-Najmee, Zayd, 'Ubayd, and the rest of those mentioned previously!!

If you were to ask: Why do you describe Faalih in this way? He has not really reached such a level.

I would say: He is as you have described, according to you and those who do not exalt Faalih, however, according to the *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah, he is above what I have mentioned to you, like it or not!!

According to the *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah, he is the highly qualified scholar, the savior, the witness of his era, and the vessel of knowledge and sciences, beautifying the years (we live in). The *imaams* of the Haddaadees are pleased with him, and they have taken him as a guide and leader!!!

This was explicitly stated by the "imaam", Tawfeeq al-Azharee, and supported by the *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah, openly broadcasting their claim. Some of them even said that he deserves more than these descriptions!! So what was Faalih to do except take them as his helpers and soldiers as he raised up the banner of the Sunnah of Haddaadiyyah! Every time they praised and lauded him outlandishly, they drew closer to him and held a higher status with him, and everything they say is correct according to him!

You might ask: So then Faalih is greater than Ibn Taymiyyah and his likes according to the *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah?

My answer to you: Is that so strange or far from the truth? Don't you know that those *imaams* have preferred their very first *imaam*, al-Haddaad, over Ibn Taymiyyah, and that his attacking and slandering Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Abil-'Izz, and others only increases them in their attachment to him?!!

Some of them used to say to scholars specialized in *'aqeedah* that it is upon them to sit on their knees in front of Umm 'Abdillaah (to learn from her), the wife of Aboo 'Abdillaah al-Haddaad!!

So how can you find it hard to accept that they hold their *imaam*, the highly qualified scholar, the savior, and the vessel of knowledge and sciences, etc. in higher esteem than Ibn Taymiyyah with regards to the different sciences of Islaam, and in higher esteem than the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel* when it comes to issues of disparagement and endorsement!!

And when it comes to declaring people to be innovators, then no one can match him from the first or last of the people!!

Due to this enormous position that Imaam Faalih holds with his people, they do not contradict him in anything, small or large. They support him in everything, especially when it comes to attacking those ignorant, misguided Murji'ah: Rabee' and those who supported his advice to Faalih. Anyone who even delays in helping this *imaam* must be attacked and ruled upon that he is from the "Waaqifah" (fence-sitters)!

Do you know who the Waaqifah were?

They were the people who withheld from taking a position on the Qur'aan, saying, "The Qur'aan is the Speech of Allaah," but they would refuse to say that it is not created. The scholars of the *Salaf*, like Imaam Ahmad and the *imaams* of *hadeeth* of his time, called them "Waaqifah". They said about the Waaqifah that they were Jahmees, and some of *Ahlus-Sunnah* used to declare these Waaqifah to be disbelievers.

The people who now withhold from supporting Faalih and his principles, not standing by his side, are being labeled "Waaqifah" by this "imaam" (Faalih), likening them to the Waaqifah of old. And this is something that the *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah support him in!!

And since supreme leadership of the Sunnah in this time has fallen upon this highly qualified scholar, savior, and vessel of knowledge and sciences, then you do not see anyone standing up to the people of misguidance and their gross errors except him and those *imaams* of Haddaadiyyah who support him. It is they who are *Ahlus-Sunnah*, those who, if they find words attributed to an *imaam* from *Ahlus-Sunnah* that seem to include a contradiction to their creed, they make it the source of an intense study, investigating it from all possible angles, since they know that the likes of these (words) do not come from the likes of these (*imaams*), since they were protected from errors in all matters, foundational and subsidiary!!!

If you were to say: Perhaps this position is not correct. I believe that the Haddaadee *imaams* are mistaken and have committed excesses with regards to how they view Shaykh Faalih, however, I do not believe he has reached even close to this degree (of straying).

I would respond to you: Where are his books? And where are his studies of the straying of the Rawaafidh, the Khawaarij, the Mu'tazilah, the Soofiyyah, the people of Hulool and Wuhdatul-Wujood, the 'Almaaniyyoon, and the rest of the stray sects?!!

In comparison, we see that Salaf used to step forward to confront every misguided sect, expose them, and clarify their misguidance. Ibn Taymiyyah stepped forward to confront the Jews, the Christians, the Rawaafidh, the Khawaarij, the Ash'ariyyah, the Soofiyyah, and in particular: the people of Wuhdatul-Wujood. He left no sect except that he refuted them. His great books that are witnesses to his deep knowledge and the strength of his arguments. All of the followers of the Salafee *manhaj* who came after him drank from the ocean of his knowledge, after the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*).

We do not see anything like these efforts or these books from Shaykh Faalih, nor do we see him picking apart the words of the Rawaafidh, nor the Khawaarij, nor the Soofiyyah, nor the Jews, Christians, or 'Almaaniyyoon, nor any of the misguided sects, their books, satellite channels, or web sites that wage war on Islaam and the Salafee *manhaj* specifically. We do not see any of these things causing him to lift a finger. We do not see any study of their attacks, while these attacks continue relentlessly against Imaam Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhaab, his books, and his creed. We do not see any of this motivating him or affecting his conscious or feelings.

Rather, we find him attacking the followers of this *imaam*, those who defend him, his creed, and his *manhaj*. We even find him demoting the *imaam*, taking away from his status.

So I say to you: The *imaams* of the Hadaadees are not able to handle these words, so they are going to launch all kinds of all-out offensives against you. I further say to you:

Firstly, Do not be hasty! These people are currently busy with Rabee' and his likes, and because of their cleverness and genius, they are studying a clear text for a very long time, inspecting it, and despite all their efforts they can not understand it! Thus, they fall into all kinds of lies and fabrications whether they know it or not!!

Secondly, we must make excuses for their *imaam*, as he either fears standing up to these sects or is too shy, or perhaps he has already authored refutations of them that he will keep secret all the way to the Day of Judgment, when he will announce his refutations of these sects for all to witness!!

If you were to say: I have seen serious extremism in how Faalih understands the words of the Salaf and Ibn Taymiyyah, in a way that is similar to the extremism of the Rawaafidh in their claim that their *imaam* makes no mistakes.

I would say to you: Yes, this is something felt from him. However, it is only in things that correspond to his desires. Whatever corresponds to his desires is the truth, according to him and his cult.

This is indeed something that contradicts the Book, the Sunnah, and the *manhaj* of the Salaf, may Allaah be pleased with them, with regards to the manner in which we are to interact with the sayings of the Salaf. This sober manner of interacting with their sayings is based on the fact that only the Prophets are protected from error in what they relay. They even understood that the Prophets could make mistakes, however, their special advantage was that Allaah would notify them of their errors and not approve of them. As for other than the Prophets, like the Companions, the Taabi'oon, and the rest of the *mujtahid imaams*, then they can be correct or mistaken. When they arrive at the truth, they receive two rewards. When they are mistaken, they receive one reward. They would say: "Everyone can have their statement accepted or rejected except the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*)."

Shaykh al-Islaam had explained that the scholars can even make mistakes in areas of creed, and they are to be excused from their mistakes, so long as they tried their best to reach the truth of the matter.

Shaykh al-Islaam (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in "Al-Qawaa'id an-Nooraaniyyah" (p.150 of Shaykh Muhammad Haamid al-Faqee's checking), "I have clarified that contradictions are found with every scholar other than the Prophets."

And we worship Allaah upon the fact that errors and contradictions are found with all the scholars, Shaykh al-Islaam and others, as is the creed of *Ahlus-Sunnah*.

However, Faalih has made himself out to be the criterion between right and wrong. Whatever opposes his position is falsehood. He is ready to humiliate anyone who opposes and discredits him, as he has done to the *imaams* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel*, and as he has done to a number of modern-day scholars and scholars of old. Whatever corresponds with his desires, even if it is erroneous and false, then he goes overboard to defend it, even by lying and claiming that scholarly consensus exists when none exists, as you have seen in this article of his that is full of lies, embellishments, and false rumors. And Shaykh al-Islaam's words about the claims of scholarly consensus has already preceded.

[The Nineteenth Point of Contention]

[19]: Faalih says:

> And Mahmood al-Haddaad, the one who is considered the founder of the Haddaadiyyah sect, used to prevent the people from invoking mercy upon the Muslims. In order to accomplish this, he used to attack *Ahlus-Sunnah*, Shaykh al-Islaam and others. He used to criticize people for invoking mercy upon the Muslims, however, he did not used to lie on them, take liberties with their words, or ascribe things to them they never said or believed. So then is this man (Rabee') more of a Haddaadee than al-Haddaad himself? Apparently, the following applies to him:
>
> **And even though I am the last (of the people) chronologically;**
> **I am coming with things that those of old were incapable of.**

These are the last of Faalih's words as relayed by Sulaymaan al-Harbee, from "Tanbeeh al-Alibbaa'"!!

Commentary:

Firstly, this is a clear proof of Faalih's lying and camouflage tactics. The Haddaadees, as has reached me, have cast aside Mahmood al-Haddaad because he was unable to keep up the pace with their extremism and wickedness. They found what they were looking for in Faalih al-Harbee, having reached the lowest depths of evil and wickedness. He embraced them and they embraced him.

And from their leaders, and I do not want to name them, while, by Allaah, I know them, is 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel, the bitter enemy of the carriers of the Salafee *manhaj* and its people. He has been the flag-bearer of Haddaadiyyah since al-Haddaad lost his energy. He is the current developer and promoter of this *manhaj* that tries to destroy the truth and its people.

He is also the inventor of the *math-hab* of *taqiyyah* (lying to get reward) and color-changing. Al-Haddaad used to speak about his opponents explicitly and shamelessly, but 'Abdul-Lateef puts *taqiyyah* and tactics of deception to use and does not confront people directly in his war of lying and scheming, except those he sees as being weak, or those who are outside of this country. In that case, he deals with them in a way that goes against his regular *manhaj*.

He hides this by feigning love for some of the scholars and honoring them, so as to remain in a position to strike the other scholars. He is from the most deceitful of the people, the most wicked of them in argumentation, and the staunchest and most shameful of them in truncating people's words. I have elaborated on some of his disgraceful actions in my book: "Izhaaq Abaateel Baashmeel".

And today, Faalih and the Haddaadees, including 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel, are all upon this wicked *manhaj*. Their current war is only an extension of their previous war, and it is more severe and deeper than the first one.

Secondly, the *math-hab* of al-Haddaad, with all its shamelessness, sinfulness, and animosity, remains in existence even today. It has only increased in harshness and rage. What is known from them is that they do not pray, along with the Muslims, over the deceased Muslims, unless they employ *taqiyyah*, nor do they invoke mercy upon the people of innovations. And who do they consider to be the people of innovations? They consider *Ahlus-Sunnah* who do not submit to this misguidance and extremism (to be from the people of innovations).

Faalih's attempts in this article to shed false tears over the disobedient Muslims is only an attempt to pull the wool over people's eyes, since he is the true *imaam* of the extremist Haddaadiyyah.

And I ask him: Isn't it Rabee' that fought the Haddaadiyyah about their extremism in this issue specifically?

If you say, "No," then you have lied, by the Lord of the heavens and the earth! By Allaah, I am upon the *manhaj* of *Ahlus-Sunnah* in all affairs, obvious ones and intricate ones, as much as I am able. Everything that you have attributed to me is from your lies and deception. And you can trust that the final outcome is in favor of the people of *taqwaa*. **﴿ As for the froth (of the flood), then it passes away as scum ﴾**, especially the lies that you and your Haddaadees have concocted.

And I hold, as I have previously held, the permissibility of invoking mercy upon the people of innovations. This is something from me that is well known to those who deal fairly, and commonly found in my books and sittings. And I am not like Faalih to claim something about myself that is not true.

Furthermore, I have debated the Haddaadees, including 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel, Fareed al-Maalikee, and Khaalid Hamzah, which resulted in many problems and calamities, due to my debate with them about this issue.

I also debated with Mahmood al-Haddaad about this issue in my book, "Mujaazafaat al-Haddaad", that I authored in the year 1414,[8] saying on p.6:

> **Fourthly**, from the turmoil that al-Haddaad and those he forced to obey him created was the *fitnah* of (not) invoking mercy upon Ibn Hajr and an-Nawawee. They were creating much turmoil over it and arguing a great deal over it. They had allegiance and disloyalty based upon it. They used to boycott and cut off ties (with their opponents) in this issue, and they have still not stopped doing these things.
>
> This *fitnah* spread to the East and to the West, reaching Tihaamah, Najd, and other places, picking up passengers and taking flight to Shaam and Yemen. Then this *fitnah* brought its trials down upon *Ahlus-Sunnah* in those places and in others like them. As a result, you see those affected by it dealing harshly with people over this issue, having allegiance and disloyalty based on it, and attacking the Salafees over it viciously.

The Haddaadees do not traverse the way of the people of the truth in these kinds of affairs. They only create turmoil with it, try to spread it far, and declare people who oppose them to be misguided and innovators because of it. They make the people think that this is the one and only *math-hab* of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*, and woe to anyone who holds a different position! This ugly way is what we were and still are fighting against. The people of knowledge and intelligence do not accept this position. They (the Haddaadees) have other kinds of turmoil they create in other issues in which they have opposed *Ahlus-Sunnah*. They even have invented lies against *Ahlus-Sunnah* that they promote in their own wicked ways. From these are the things that Faalih has fallen into in this article of his.

In my refutation of Abul-Hasan al-Misree in the book **"I'aanatu Abil-Hasan 'alar-Rujoo' billatee Heya Ahsan",** I stated quite explicitly that it is permissible to pray over the people of innovations, the very issue that was the source of debate, saying, **"These people, dear brother, are not saying that invoking mercy is *haraam*, rather they are only saying that invoking mercy all the time upon someone like Sayyid Qutb could have negative effects."** (Footnote #2, p.13; see also: the footnote on p.17)

I also stated in the fourth and fifth points in my article, "Distinguishing Characteristics of the Haddaadiyyah", in refutation of them:

> **4 – The all-inclusive prohibition of invoking mercy on the people of innovations, there being no difference between a Raafidhee, Qadaree, Jahmee, or a scholar who fell into an innovation.**

[8] **Translator:** About 12 years before the publication of this book.

> **5 – Labeling people innovators when they invoke mercy upon Aboo Haneefah, ash-Shawkaanee, Ibn al-Jawzee, Ibn Hajr, or an-Nawawee.**

And we used to, and we continue to, repel this turmoil the Haddaadiyyah create over the invoking of mercy upon the people of innovations and those only they consider innovators.

I also stated in my book, "Haqeeqatul-Manhaj al-Waasi' 'ind Abil-Hasan", debating him:

> **Invoking mercy upon the people of innovation is permissible according to *Ahlus-Sunnah*. You lean back and relax (in agreement) with this, however, your implementation of this with such fervor and these kinds of excesses leads you to do things that are not Salafee. You do not find this spirit or the excessive praises (of the people of innovations) with the truthful ones of *Ahlus-Sunnah*. Some of these excessive praises (of the people of innovations) are things that they would not even say about the great *imaams* of *Ahlus-Sunnah*! It is as if you are claiming, with this feverish manner of yours, that: 'I am not from those harsh Salafees. I am a man with wide vision and an expansive *manhaj*. How could this not be so when I wage war on the Salafees to defend you and enter you into the fold of *Ahlus-Sunnah* against their wishes.** (Refer to the first footnote on p.21 of the mentioned book.)

As for the openly disobedient person, then I had quoted the opinion of Shaykh al-Islaam (may Allaah have mercy on him).

And from the things that clear me of the accusations of Faalih in this issue, aside from the explicit nature of the words of Shaykh al-Islaam, are the following:

[1] The subject of the book is: *fiqh* opinions. This subject only deals with affairs of differing, as is the case in this issue. Among these issues are those that Shaykh al-Islaam held a strange position in, so much so that opponents of his might claim that he has opposed scholarly consensus. However, they are mistaken in their claim of scholarly consensus, while the opinion he held in the issue may indeed be a strange one.

Al-'Allaamah Burhaan ad-Deen Ibraaheem ibn Muhammad ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah [d.767H], may Allaah have mercy on him, the author of "Ikhtiyaaraat Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah" said (p.121):

> **We do not know of any issue that he has contradicted scholarly consensus in. Whoever claims such a thing is either an ignoramus or a liar. On the other hand, positions that are attributed to him, that he is alone in, are of four types:**

> **The first type is a position that is very strange, and thus it is said about him that he has opposed scholarly consensus, since it was such a rare position that is hidden from many of the people, and due also to the claims of scholarly consensus in the issue by some of the scholars.**
>
> **The second type is a position that contradicts the four *math-habs*, however it was the choice of some of the Companions, the Salaf, or the Taabi'oon. Thus, differing in these issues is something that has been reported… (And he went on to mention the other two types.)**

[2] I do not hold, nor did Shaykh al-Islaam hold, that the openly disobedient person is a disbeliever due to his sinning. This is not the case, even though the whole world has stood up and will not sit down because of it.

[3] In the case that an openly disobedient person is someone who abandons the prayer, then the majority of the Companions held that he is a disbeliever. The majority of *Ahlul-Hadeeth* took this position from them, too. So will Faalih also be astonished at the Companions and those who followed their position and did not pray over such people, since they declared them to be disbelievers? Will he rule upon them that they also prevented him from invoking mercy?

[4] The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) refrained from praying over the one who stole from the war booty before its distribution and the one who committed suicide. So will he say that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*) withheld from invoking mercy upon them, and that Faalih is more merciful than the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam*)?!

[5] Many of the Salaf used to refrain from prayer over the people of innovations,[9] while it (the prayer) is the invoking of mercy upon the deceased. So will the extremely compassionate and concerned Faalih now attack them, since they withheld from invoking mercy upon a Muslim who had not left the fold of Islaam?

He said about al-Haddaad, "And Mahmood al-Haddaad, the one who is considered the founder of the Haddaadiyyah sect, used to prevent the people from invoking mercy upon the Muslims. In order to accomplish this, he used to attribute this to Ahlus-Sunnah, Shaykh al-Islaam and others. He used to prohibit people from invoking mercy upon the Muslims…"

I say: What do you want, O intelligent one (!), by describing him as, "The one who is considered the founder of the Haddaadiyyah sect"?

Do you want to free yourself from the Haddaadee *math-hab*, while you are the most dangerous leader they have, raising the flag of Haddaadiyyah and waging war against the Salafees of the past and present, all based on this destructive *manhaj*?

---

[9] *Majmoo' al-Fataawaa* (24/286)

Are you making fun of the people, playing games on them by using these camouflaged expressions?!

The Salafees are too aware and honorable to fall for these phrases and this stupid camouflaging that resembles the ostrich and how it sticks its head under the dirt when it becomes afraid, leaving its entire body in the open, exposed for all to see!!

I further say: Yes indeed, al-Haddaad's case is just as you have described. He has other issues as well. However, Faalih has never felt enough emotion to go and refute him, pretending to sleep and playing dead so that he does not have to refute him in this issue!

On the other hand, Rabee' is actually the one who refuted him and sent him on his way by Allaah's Permission, aiding Allaah's Religion, and defending the scholars and the *manhaj* of Shaykh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allaah have mercy on him). Has Shaykh al-Islaam, Ibn al-Qayyim, ath-Thahabee, Ibn 'Abdil-Wahhaab, al-Albaanee, Ibn 'Uthaymeen, or any of the other scholars found any safety from you?!!

I further say: If you truly had any respect for the scholars and were known for such a virtue, then it would be upon you to refute this man in this issue that you oppose him in.

Instead, you are more evil than him, with regards to your *manhaj*, manners, and your many words against the scholars and their methodologies and creed. You have become known for this, and thus, these words of yours are not accepted. Furthermore, no one other than the dumbest and most ignorant of the people would believe you.

And why do you only mention the deviation of al-Haddaad in this lone affair, and you remain silent about him in when it comes to much more dangerous issues?!

Is it because your corrupt *manhaj* is more dangerous than his? And that your principles are more corrupt than his? And that your war against *Ahlus-Sunnah* and their scholars is more severe, expansive, and lasting than his?

Apparently, this is the only reason that prevents you from speaking against his *manhaj*. And I have not seen camouflaging tactics that create such confusion, and the turning of tables more intense than what has come from the Haddaadiyyah, with Faalih al-Harbee and 'Abdul-Lateef Baashmeel leading the way.

You said about al-Haddaad:

> He did not used to lie on them, take liberties with their words, or ascribe things to them they never said or believed. So then is this man (Rabee') more of a Haddaadee than al-Haddaad himself? Apparently, the following applies to him:
>
> **And even though I am the last (of the people) chronologically;**
> **I am coming with things that those of old were incapable of.**

I say: This is most likely from the scheming ways of the Haddaadiyyah! How can you free him of lying while his lies that he concocted against the scholars of al-Madeenah has been counted at **120**!

Furthermore, did he not use to invent false principles and attribute them to *Ahlus-Sunnah*?! And did he not use to attack *Ahlus-Sunnah* because they opposed him?!

And with all of this, you are more of a liar than he is! Al-Haddaad or anyone else could never catch up to you in how you attribute things to innocent people.

And calling you a Haddaadee is not enough of a description for you.

And you and no one else are the most deserving of the people to have that line of poetry recited to you. It more appropriately fits you more than any of those that you have lied against. And you are the one who has come up with more principles than the people of knowledge could have ever imagined, the scholars of hadeeth from them and others.

As the saying goes, **"She accused me of her own illness and then slipped away."**

And the other one goes, **"And upon her own family,**[10] **Baraaqish (the guard dog) brought disaster"!!**

Verily Allaah has destroyed your plotting and planning:

He, the Exalted One, has said (what means), ❴ **And they plot, and Allaah plans, and Allaah is the best of planners** ❵.

And He, the Glorified One, has said (what means), ❴ **Verily they are plotting a scheme, but I too am planning a plan** ❵.

Surely Allaah has repelled your scheme and the scheme of your sect, and sent it back upon your own necks, and He has made you an example that the people will learn from.

And the conclusion of our *da'wah* is: All praise is due to Allaah, Lord of all that exists.

And may Allaah's *Salaah* and *Salaam* be upon our Prophet Muhammad, and upon all his family and Companions.

Written by:

---

[10] **Translator:** In the Arabic version: "**And upon her own family…**" The shaykh requested this change.

Rabee' ibn Haadee ibn 'Umayr al-Madkhalee

The 14th of Jumaadaa ath-Thaanee, 1426H [11]

[11] Translated by Moosaa Richardson and completed by Allaah's Permission on the 13th night of Rajab, 1426. Edited by Hassan as-Sumaalee, may Allaah reward him generously (1426/7/17).